CLERK'S OFFICE U.S. DIST. COURT AT ROANOKE, VA FILED

APR 1 5 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTOHN F. COFFICE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA: ROANOKE DIVISION DEPUT

GORDON GRAY COCKERHAM, Petitioner,)	Criminal Action No. 4:03-cr-70074 Civil Action No. 7:05-cv- 00221
v.)	MEMORANDUM OPINION
UNITED STATES, Respondent.)))	By: Jackson L. Kiser Senior United States District Judge

Petitioner Gordon Gray Cockerham, a federal inmate proceeding <u>pro se</u>, brings this action to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. In his petition, Cockerham requests re-sentencing as a result of a new constitutional rule announced in the Supreme Court's opinions in <u>Blakely v. Washington</u>, 124 S. Ct. 2531, 159 L. Ed. 2d 403 (2004) and <u>United States v. Booker</u>, 125 S. Ct. 738 (Jan. 12, 2005).

Cockerham's conviction became final on May 9, 2004, when the ten-day period in which to file a notice of appeal expired. See Fed. R. App. Pro. 4(b)(1)(A)(i).

It appears that Cockerham is attempting to claim that <u>Blakely</u> is a new rule, which is retroactive to cases on collateral review. However, the court finds that <u>Blakely</u> does not apply retroactively to Cockerham's case. <u>See Lilly v. United States</u>, 342 F. Supp. 2d 532 (W.D.Va. 2004). In addition, because Cockerham has admitted that he did not appeal his sentence, it is clear that his claims would be procedurally barred. <u>See Bousley v. United States</u>, 523 U.S. 614, 621 (1998).

Because the rule in <u>Blakely</u> does not apply retroactively to Cockerham's case, the court must dismiss his petition. An appropriate order will be entered this day.

ENTER: This _______day of April, 2005

Senior United States District Judge